**Q 1. Attempt both parts.**

1. **How the community based participatory progress have been addressed. Do you think this participatory evaluation strategy is useful.**

Yes, Community-Based Participatory Research and evaluation strategy is useful as if we consider the paper, we can conclude that this strategy worked and was found to be useful. This paper describes the process of development and implementation of a participatory evaluation framework within a CBPR program to reduce breast, cervical, and colorectal cancer disparities between African Americans and whites in Alabama and Mississippi as well as lessons learned.

Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) is a promising methodology that not only nurtures research and capacity building, but also promotes possession and sustainability by mobilizing underserved communities as political and social actors in the elimination of cancer disparities.

CBPR is “a partnership approach to research that equitably involves, for example, community members, organizational representatives, and researchers in all aspects of the research process.”

Although the concept of community empowerment and community partnership have been successfully used in education and public health in the past 30 years, most of these programs have been implemented in developing countries. Under this approach, community partners, along with academic partners, share responsibilities and priorities and solutions are implemented in partnership rather than placing academicians or health care professionals in decision-making roles for the community.

A major component of the process evaluation was to assess fidelity of the proposed program and collaborative participation of network partners to determine whether this methodology was effective in developing a culturally relevant approach to mobilize a community to reduce/eliminate health disparities in breast, cervical, and colorectal cancer between African Americans and whites in targeted counties in Alabama and Mississippi.

1. Discuss participatory evaluation in your own words.

Participatory evaluation involves all the stakeholders in a project - those directly affected by it or by carrying it out - in contributing to the understanding of it, and in applying that understanding to the improvement of the work.

Participatory approaches tools include workshop-based and community-based methods for collaborative decision-making methods for stakeholder consultation and methods for incorporating participation and social analysis in project design.

Participatory Evaluation is appropriate training for everyone involved. Some Stakeholders may not even be aware that the project research takes place; others may have no idea how to work alongside people from different backgrounds; and still others may not know what to do with evaluation results once they have them.

**Four main principles when conducting participatory evaluation:**

* Everyone involved in the program shares control over the evaluation process;
* The objectives are set jointly, in a group, with all the people concerned in the program, keeping in mind that everyone has his or her own agenda;
* Working out the difficulties faced by everyone helps in strengthening the program;
* There is a process of collective awareness raising.”

**Advantages of Participatory Evaluation:**

* It gives you a better perspective on both the initial needs of the project's beneficiaries, and on its ultimate effects. It can get you information you wouldn't get otherwise.
* It tells you what worked and what didn't from the perspective of those most directly involved - beneficiaries and staff.
* It can tell you why something does or doesn't work.
* It results in a more effective project.
* It empowers stakeholders.
* It can provide a voice for those who are often not heard.
* It teaches skills that can be used in employment and other areas of life.
* It boosts self-confidence and self-esteem in those who may have little of either.
* It demonstrates to people ways in which they can take more control of their lives.
* It encourages stakeholder ownership of the project.
* It can spark creativity in everyone involved. It encourages working collaboratively.

**Challenges in implementing and using participatory evaluation**

* Time and commitment
* Resources
* Conflicts between approaches
* Unclear purpose of participation, or a purpose that is not aligned with evaluation design
* Lack of facilitation skills
* Only focusing on participation in one aspect of the evaluation process, e.g. data collection
* Lack of cultural and contextual understanding, and the implications of these for the evaluation design

**Q 2. If proper monitoring and evaluation exists the failure of projects will be minimum. Comment with reference to research article of Charles Guandaru and Humam Bin Mohamed (Article 2)**

According to PMBOK, in order for the project managers to achieve project success, they need to monitor and control the processes of producing the products, services or results that the project was undertaken to produce.

Many complex, long-term projects fail to live up to their promises and produce disappointing outcomes on completion. Some of these are well-known for exceeding their budgets or deadlines or both. Some of common causes of project failure are:

* Poorly defined project scope
* Inadequate risk management
* Failure to identify key assumptions
* Project managers who lack experience and training
* No use of formal methods and strategies
* Lack of effective communication at all levels
* Key staff leaving the project and/or company
* Poor management of expectations
* Ineffective leadership
* Lack of detailed documentation
* Failure to track requirements
* Failure to track progress
* Lack of detail in the project plans
* Inaccurate time and effort estimates
* Cultural differences in global projects

Regular collection of information through continuous monitoring assist project managers in making timely decisions, guarantee accountability, and provide the basis for evaluation and learning.

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) are described as a process that assists project managers in improving performance and achieving results. The goal of M&E is to improve current and future management of outputs, outcomes and impact. Effective monitoring and evaluation would play a vital role in detecting the signs of project failure and hence suggesting corrective actions that may be necessary.

Most project managers appreciate that monitoring and evaluation of projects is important if the project objectives and success is to be achieved. Project monitoring and evaluation exercise adds value to the overall efficiency of project planning, management and implementation by offering corrective action to the variances from the expected standard.

Kontinen and Robinson identified Lack of monitoring tools, difficulty in defining performance indicators and short time allocation to Monitoring and Evaluation as some of the challenges that constantly face the project monitoring function. When Monitoring and Evaluation faces various challenges, its effectiveness is at stake hence impacting on the project success.

If Monitoring and Evaluation is not automated. This may lead to delays in data collection and analysis. This will enable automatic data capturing and processing based on the actual project performance. Since full automation of Monitoring and Evaluation process may not be practically possible, it may be difficult to fully eliminate the problem of delays in detecting the variances.

The monitoring team perhaps may be lacking the necessary capacity or strength to carry out their work effectively, or they may be approaching their work using incorrect methodologies. The project monitoring team may also be lacking the necessary management support.

Generally, projects implemented by the county government were successful. The success of these projects was as a result of strong M&E function within the relevant projects; a fair M&E approach which produced a good feedback; closely monitoring the project at all stages in the project lifecycle and minimal political interference on the project management.

Management support was also a contributing factor to the success of project in the country. The management acted as a mediator between the project M&E function and project success. M&E function was found to be a significant factor which contributes to projects success.

The research findings in this study suggest that projects can still fail despite having an M&E function. This would be as a result of a weakness in M&E, poor approach to M&E, lack of management support on the project functions, and political interference especially in Africa and developing countries

I agree with the study that if and only if a proper monitoring and evaluation exists and performs the tasks well then only in that case project failure can be minimized. The study addresses the research problem that; despite existence of a monitoring and evaluation function in most projects, there are still project failures. The research found out that project success (or lack of it) was attributable to efficiency of monitoring and evaluation function.

Some examples of successful projects in Kenya.

* The Youth Enterprise Development Fund; whose objective was to increase economic opportunities for the youth as a way of enabling them to participate in nation building;
* the self-reliant agriculture (SRA) projects which were meant to help the villagers become self-reliant by growing their own food. This program was viewed as successful since it realized its goals through training local population of Mnyenzeni on how to raise their own food.

**Q 3. Comment on the methodology and literature review of Lavagnon A. Ika (article 3, “project management in the international development……”.**

This research examines the empirical relationship between PM efforts (the extent to which project coordinators make use of available tools, techniques, and methods) project success, and project success criteria as perceived by African IDP coordinators. In the research, we rely on the sole judgment of the coordinators. Therefore, our results depend heavily on the quality of their mental model. The information that refers to this subjective judgment is rated on a Likert scale from 1 to 5 (i.e. from strongly disagree to strongly agree for project success measures and from never to always regarding the extent to which IDPM tools and techniques are used).

The overall assessment of project success has to be made on the first page of the questionnaire. Only respondents who skim through the entire questionnaire before answering any question will know about the subsequent success items that are available on different pages. According to the geographical distribution of the respondent countries, one can say that they are fairly represented and there is no significant geographical bias that can distort potential generalization of research findings.

It is noteworthy to recall that 600 questionnaires in French and in English were mailed to project managers, coordinators, and directors in 26 countries, most of them south of Sahara. A response rate of about 15 percent (93 answers) was obtained and judged acceptable considering the difficult conditions in which this kind of survey had been done.

Internal consistency and reliability tests were performed on project success dimensions, we focus here on the questionnaire statements that refer to the application of IDPM tools. In fact, the Cronbach alpha for the complete sample is 0.80, 0.76 and 0.67, respectively, for sub-samples with seven or three statements only.

PM is the art and science of transforming vision into reality. Although there are a lot of definitions, the PMI one is the most known: the application of knowledge, skills, tools, and techniques to bring about the successful completion of specific project goals and objectives. As such, it involves planning, organizing, monitoring, and controlling the project and requires its own tools and techniques.

Tools and techniques are concrete and specific means that PM practitioners use to apply rules, principles, and skills “to do the job,” “to execute a process” or metaphorically speaking “to execute the recipe,” and “to play the partition”. Numerous PM tools, techniques, methods, and processes have been developed and disseminated through books, journals, and professional bodies.

Specific PM tools and techniques are required for specific phases of the project lifecycle. If we consider the conventional PMI project lifecycle, one could distinguish between initiation tools, planning tools, execution (and monitoring, controlling, and reporting) tools, and closing (evaluation) tools. During the initiation phase, project formal design preparation tools such as the logical framework (or “log frame” (LF)), the project charter/project proposal, needs and market assessment tools, problem analysis tools, option analysis tools are recurrent and critical.

Since the emergence of the PM discipline in the 1950s and the 1960s, project scheduling, budgeting, and planning techniques such as critical path method (CPM) and program evaluation and review technique (PERT) have been at the cornerstone of PM. In particular, detailed network schedule approaches and computational models are extensively used for aerospace, defense, and construction projects. But neither PERT approach nor the detailed networks are used for other types of projects and at the top level of truly excellent organizations like Hewlett-Packard.

Contextual influences seem to play their part in PM and in project planning and implementation in particular. In addition to the type of project and the phase of the project lifecycle, it has been shown that strategic importance of the project, level of experience of the project team, personnel constraints within the implementing organization, occurrence of technological breakthrough, technology uncertainty, the mono- or multi-project situation, the number of parallel projects, the mono- or multi-implementers situation, or the number of project stakeholders, the business or industry sector, affect PM and the usage of PM tools and techniques.

Finally, for the critical aspects of projects such as – quality, risk, and communication management – very few effective tools and techniques are available, except the project management body of knowledge (PMBOK) project stakeholders’ analysis. Other tools and techniques are, therefore, welcomed for a quality project planning and an efficient project implementation.

This is characterized by the prescriptive approach, most concerned with “what should be done” rather than a descriptive approach “what does happen,” which is the mechanistically orientated underlying philosophy at the basis of all the IDPs’ models, cycles, or sequences. Also, IDPM practitioners and field consultants who outline the project cycles were often associated with the financial, economic, or engineering aspects of the IDPs.

As a result, the traditional IDP cycle, a natural sequence in the way IDPs are planned and carried out, a paradigm grounded in the engineering tradition, process, and content wise, was put in place, with an orderly progression from identification to preparation, appraisal, negotiation, and board approval, implementation and evaluation, that has made a lot to the professionalization of the IDPM.

Five broad approaches or categories of tools and techniques at the identification, the preparation, the appraisal, the approval, and the evaluation phases of the project cycle have evolved: economic cost-benefit analysis (CBA) (economic analysis), private or financial CBA (financial analysis), social CBA, technical targets (for physical measures or indicators relevant to project purpose), and participatory approaches tools.

project lifecycle has been broken into three major phases. This is very instructive for purposes of comparison with the PMI project cycle: “planning” (pre-identification, identification, preparation, and approval); “executive” (redefinition, mobilization and actual implementation, and monitoring); and ongoing operations (evaluation). It is indeed in that “executive” phase that implementation planning is actually done (planning, scheduling, control, and supervision) and institutional arrangements such as project organization and PM are decided upon. Once the project plan is approved at the preparation and appraisal phases, a project manager, often a local civil servant with expertise in the sector, is appoints a project coordinator or a national (field) project coordinator (NPC), who will be in charge of the actual implementation of the project. The role of the NPC is not to create a project plan in first place like in the conventional PM but to update, to refine or to redefine the project and therefore to respond intelligently to project plan- or goal-changes. The NPC is not a project planner, but a project preplanner and implementer.

To the bulk of monitoring tools, one could add participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) tool, which contrarily to the conventional PMIS, is neither a tool of control by PM and donor agencies nor an end but rather a management process/tool that involves multiple stakeholders or target groups in the observation and evaluation of project activities and that enhances the learning of all actors.

Apart from the technical targets, tools such as cost effectiveness analysis (efficiency assessment) that indicate whether physical targets are unrealistically low compared to the resources used; with/without analysis (impact assessment) that rely on picturing the counterfactual scenario without the project to broadly assess the likely contribution of the IDP to its goal and quick and dirty techniques like the “potential impact” approach are being used in practice.

In this research, we choose the descriptive approach towards the NPC role and to analyze the perceptions of African NPCs concerning the extent to which they make use of tools, techniques, and available methods. Furthermore, we measure the strength of the relationship between this use of IDPM tools, techniques and methods and project success.

Project success is project efficiency, and effectiveness. But project success remains an ambiguous, inclusive, and multidimensional concept and its definition and measurement are bound to a specific context. This formula is usually the triangle of time, cost, and quality, which in the aid industry sector are the clients’ terms of reference. However, projects have often been delivered within time, cost, and quality standards, only to be considered failures sometime later. Also, other projects that exceeded time or cost constraints were considered successful.

A project may be perceived as a success by the client but as a failure by the management, if they hold differing perspectives on the project results. From the square of time, cost, quality, and satisfaction proposed by Baker et al. (1974/1988) project success becomes a hexagon of time, cost, quality, and achievement of strategic objectives of the client organization that initiated the project, satisfaction of final users, and satisfaction of other stakeholders.

Ideally, the project would result in a win-win situation for everybody, but reality is rather cruel and when we appreciate project success, it is reasonable to wonder whether we are looking at the forest or at the trees.

Project success is not even in the “glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management” of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2002). Instead, the DAC speaks of effectiveness. In the aid industry sector, project success is referred to as efficiency and effectiveness. The DAC has five criteria for measuring project success: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability.

**Q 4. Summarize the article of Sajjad Hussain and Saira Miraj. Also discuss the methodology they used.**

During the last few decades, the developing countries including Pakistan have launched developmental programmes for the welfare of their masses. These developmental programmes lacked sustainability mainly due to defective planning, lack of coordination between government departments, scarcity of financial resources and lack of participation of the target community. The international community in the world conference on Agrarian Reforms and Rural Development, held in Rome in 1979, acknowledged that developmental projects lack sustainability due lack of meaningful participation of stakeholders in developmental interventions.

The concept of participation was mainly promoted by NGOs since 1950s to the early 80s through developmental projects. In the past, developmental activities lacked sustainability due to proper monitoring of developmental programmes, implementation and lack of participation of beneficiaries in the planning. The need and importance of community participation in sustainable development process was realized in the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio in 1992. It was based on the Brundtland Commission’s Report known as “Our Common Future” in 1987 (Brundtland Commission, 1987). The world leaders in this conference held that the goals of sustainable development cannot be attained unless the recipients are involved in the process at the local level.

Various factors can play vital role in the sustainability of developmental programmes which consists of careful planning, proper implementation and effective supervision.

Pakistan Rural Support Programmes like „National Rural Support Program‟, „Agha Khan rural Support Program‟ followed by „Sindh Rural Support program‟, „Baluchistan Rural Support Program, followed by „Sindh Rural Support Program‟ and „Punjab Rural Support Program‟ have also adopted participatory development approach for involving stakeholders in the decision making and planning process at the grassroots level.

Participatory development largely focuses on weaker sections of society with the belief that these people have the required resources and local knowledge to resolve their problems on self-help basis. Participatory development affords equal opportunities of self-development and changes the social and economic structure so that the people can have more chances of participation in development planning, irrespective of their gender, race, religion, political affiliation and economic standing.

Participation of the target community in developmental interventions is indispensable component for empowerment of the powerless people. Participation helps in improving the living condition of marginalized people and places the benefits in the hands of poor people who are the real stakeholders in the development process.

**Factors Promoting Participation:**

* Flexibility in the Process of Participation and Local Knowledge

The process of participation should be adaptable so that it can be adjusted to the changing conditions. In addition, such environment should be provided where every person irrespective of race, class and gender should take part in decision making process.

* Financial, Material and Non-material Benefits

Participation in community development projects is subject to the provision of material and non-material benefits to the target communities. Bowen (2007) stated that material incentives motivate communities to take part in developmental activities. According to Samah &Aref, (2009) non-material benefits includes insights, trust and the skills to solve the existing problems faced by the community and encourage people to participate in developmental activities.

* Development Needs and Linkages of Implementing Agency with Target Communities

People participate in developmental project when they observe that the developmental projects are identified by them and are in accordance with their needs an aspiration. Hence development needs, development interest and project needs are the contributing factors in promoting participation in development interventions (Samah& Aref, 2009).

**Factors Hindering Community Participation**

It is established fact that community participation aims to empower those people who are excluded from the main stream development process. However, this approach has been criticized as well.

Powerful segments i.e. Khan, Malak, Chaudry or Wadera play an important role in all the decisions of the community. The traditional leaders at the local level hamper the process of participation and try to monopolize the process for personal benefit instead of communal welfare. The environment of the implementing agency also plays a vital role in the feasibility of participatory development. Lack of amiable atmosphere inside the agency also hampers the feasibility of community participation in the process of development.